

1

2

3

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

5

6

7

P. STEPHEN LAMONT,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
DAVID KRANE, et al.,  
Defendants.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No. [5:18-cv-04327-EJD](#)

**ORDER DENYING NON-PARTY  
ARUMAI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S  
MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 90, 91, 93

Presently before the court is a three-page motion to appoint counsel by Arumai Technologies, Inc. (“Arumai”) filed under the ECF user Stephen Lamont, pro se Plaintiff in the above captioned case, to enable Arumai to file a motion to intervene. Dkt. No. 90 (“Mot.”). Defendants Google Ventures and David Krane (“GV”) filed an opposition (Dkt. No. 91) to which Defendants Kevin Connor and Conner & Associates (“Conner”) join (Dkt. No. 93).

This court holds no authority in appointment of counsel for a corporation in a civil matter. *See Inland Concrete Enters. v. Kraft Ams. L.P.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 180334, at \*6 (C.D. Cal. July 6, 2015) citing, *NK Beer Wine, Inc. v. United States*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55032, \*3 (W.D. Mich. June 29, 2009), citing *Specialty Vehicle Acquisition Corp. v. Am. Sunroof Corp.*, No. 07-13887, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8934, at \*4 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 7, 2008) (“There is no provision in a statute, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the Local Rules allowing this Court to appoint counsel for a corporation in a civil matter. Nor is there any source of funding available to pay an attorney to represent a corporation in a civil matter.”).

Arumai’s motion to appoint counsel will be denied. Here, this motion is filed by a non-

Case No.: [5:18-cv-04327-EJD](#)  
ORDER DENYING NON-PARTY ARUMAI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S MOTION TO  
APPOINT COUNSEL

1 party unverified corporation without any supported affidavit or declaration as required by Civil  
2 Local Rule 7-2(d). Arumai cites no authority in its request. The motion is also unsigned and  
3 instead simply includes three names at the end of the document: Gregory B. Thagard, Shyam  
4 Krishnamurthy, and Philippe Gaglione. Mot. at 3. The motion states that Arumai seeks to  
5 intervene in Plaintiff Lamont's action against Defendants Conner, GV, and Catherine Straggas.  
6 And that, according to Arumai, thirty-eight law firms in the San Francisco Bay Area are prohibited  
7 from representing it due to conflict checks. Mot. at 2.

8 In addition to the lack of compliance with the local rules in filing of this motion, Arumai  
9 does not provide sufficient facts or authority to support this court in taking such an extraordinary  
10 action in appointing counsel in this civil action. *Hernandez v. San Diego Sheriff's Dep't*, 2000  
11 U.S. App. LEXIS 9959, at \*5 (9th Cir. 2000) (stating “[t]here is no constitutional right to counsel  
12 in civil cases, and district courts may appoint counsel in civil cases only under exceptional  
13 circumstances”).

14 Accordingly, the motion to appoint counsel is denied.

15  
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: May 7, 2019



---

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
EDWARD J. DAVILA  
United States District Judge

Case No.: [5:18-cv-04327-EJD](#)  
ORDER DENYING NON-PARTY ARUMAI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S MOTION TO  
APPOINT COUNSEL